arXiv:cond-mat/0702188v1 [cond-mat.str-el] 7 Feb 2007

Comment on "New Mean-Field Theory of the $tt't''J$ Model Applied to the High-T$_c$ Superconductors"

Alvaro Ferraz[1], Evgueny Kochetov[1,2], and Bruno Uchoa[1,3]
[1]*International Center of Condensed Matter Physics, C.P. 04667, Brasilia, DF, Brazil*
[2]*Bogoliubov Theoretical Laboratory, Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, 141980 Dubna, Russia and*
[3]*Physics Department, Boston University, 590 Commonwealth Ave., Boston, MA 02215*

PACS numbers: 74.20.Mn, 74.20.-z

The authors of ref. [1] introduce a new mean-field (MF) approach to the t-J model of strongly correlated electrons in terms of lattice spinons and doped carriers, by constructing an enlarged Hilbert space with physical and unphysical states. The purpose of this construction is clear: to address the relaxation of the non-double occupancy (NDO) constraint for the lattice electrons in a controlled way. In this Comment, we show that the unphysical states are not properly excluded and despite the claimed good agreement of their results with experiment, the consistency of their MF theory is unmotivated.

The original on-site 3d Hilbert space of the t-J Hamiltonian restricted by the NDO constraint includes a lattice electron spin-up state, a lattice electron spin down-state, and a vacancy state: $\mathcal{H}_{phys} := \{|\uparrow\rangle, |\downarrow\rangle, |0\rangle\}$. In order to recast such a model in terms of the spinon and Gutzwiller projected dopon operators, the authors consider instead the enlarged on-site Hilbert space, $\mathcal{H}^{enl} = \{|\uparrow, 0\rangle, |\downarrow, 0\rangle, |\uparrow,\uparrow\rangle, |\uparrow,\downarrow\rangle, |\downarrow,\uparrow\rangle, |\downarrow,\downarrow\rangle\}$. Here the first label denotes the up and down states of lattice spins, whereas the second corresponds to the three dopon on-site states, namely, the no dopon, spin-up and spin-down dopon states. The physical space $\mathcal{H}_{phys}$ can then be identified with the 3d subspace $\mathcal{H}^{enl}_{phys}$ by the following covariant mapping, $|\uparrow\rangle \to |\uparrow, 0\rangle$, $|\downarrow\rangle \to |\downarrow, 0\rangle$, $|0\rangle \to \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\uparrow,\downarrow\rangle - |\downarrow,\uparrow\rangle)$. The unphysical states are $\{|\uparrow,\uparrow\rangle, |\downarrow,\downarrow\rangle, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\uparrow,\downarrow\rangle + |\downarrow,\uparrow\rangle)\} = \mathcal{H}^{enl}_{unphys}$. Under this mapping, $|0\rangle\langle\uparrow| \to \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\uparrow,\downarrow\rangle - |\downarrow,\uparrow\rangle)\langle\uparrow, 0| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left[(\frac{1}{2} + S^z)\tilde{d}^\dagger_\downarrow - S^- \tilde{d}^\dagger_\uparrow\right] =: \tilde{c}_\uparrow$. Although $\vec{S}$ and $\tilde{d}_\sigma = d_\sigma(1 - d^\dagger_{-\sigma} d_{-\sigma})$, by definition, act in the whole of $\mathcal{H}^{enl}$, mixing up physical and unphysical states, their specific combinations given by the $\tilde{c}_\sigma$ operators act, as correctly stated in [1], only on $\mathcal{H}^{enl}_{phys}$ annihilating all the unphysical states. This is because the $\tilde{c}_\sigma$ operators are by construction isomorphic to the Hubbard operators $|0\rangle\langle\sigma|$, which satisfy the NDO condition. However, the MF $t-J$ Hamiltonian cannot be written in terms of $\tilde{c}_\sigma$ operators only and necessarily acts in $\mathcal{H}^{enl}$. In this enlarged space the NDO completeness relation given by $\frac{1}{2}(|\uparrow,\downarrow\rangle - |\downarrow,\uparrow\rangle)(\langle\uparrow,\downarrow| - \langle\downarrow,\uparrow|) + |\uparrow 0\rangle\langle\uparrow 0| + |\downarrow 0\rangle\langle\downarrow 0| = 1$ just becomes a *constraint*. It must be imposed to avoid mixing of physical and unphysical states. In terms of the spinon and dopon operators this constraint reads, $\mathcal{C} = \vec{J}^2 - 3/4(1-n) = 0$. Here $\vec{J} = \vec{S} + \vec{M}$ is the total spin on each lattice site, and $\vec{M} = \tilde{d}^\dagger \vec{\sigma} \tilde{d}$ and $n = \tilde{d}^\dagger \tilde{d}$ are the local dopon spin and number operators, respectively. This means that the on-site total spin can either be $j = 0$ or $j = 1/2$, excluding the unphysical states with $j = 1$ [2].

This constraint is missed in [1]. In contrast with the exact representation given by their Eq.(2), the MF Hamiltonian (3) mixes up both physical and unphysical sectors and the unphysical states contribute to the MF phase diagram. Contrary to the statement made in [3], the operator constraint $\mathcal{C}_i = 0$ is not equivalent to the on-site conditions $n_i \vec{J}_i = 0$ in the enlarged space. As a consequence, in contrast with the average constraint based on the completeness relation, the conditions $< n_i \vec{J}_i >= 0$ do not discriminate between physical and unphysical states, making their MF theory inconsistent [4]. Note finally that the unphysical states may affect the dopon and spinon Green functions even beyond the MF approximation. For example, for any $H = H(\tilde{c}^\dagger_\sigma, \tilde{c}_\sigma)$ one gets, $tr(\tilde{d}^\dagger_\uparrow(t)\tilde{d}_\uparrow) = tr(e^{-itH}\tilde{d}^\dagger_\uparrow e^{itH}\tilde{d}_\uparrow) = tr(\tilde{d}^\dagger_\uparrow(t)\tilde{d}_\uparrow)_{\mathcal{C}=0} + \langle\uparrow\uparrow|(e^{-itH}\tilde{d}^\dagger_\uparrow e^{itH}\tilde{d}_\uparrow)|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle = tr(\tilde{d}^\dagger_\uparrow(t)\tilde{d}_\uparrow)_{\mathcal{C}=0} + \langle\uparrow, 0|e^{-itH}|\uparrow, 0\rangle$, demonstrating that the unphysical state $|\uparrow,\uparrow\rangle$ produces a non-trivial contribution if not excluded by the constraint.

---

[1] T.C. Ribeiro and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 057001 (2005).

[2] In the undoped case ($n_i = 0$) this constraint reduces to the equation $\vec{S}_i^2 = 3/4$ which is appropriate for the conventional $s = 1/2$ Heisenberg model.

[3] T.C. Ribeiro and X.-G. Wen, Reply to this Comment.

[4] In the enlarged Hilbert space the $\mathcal{C}_i$ operator is a projection matrix, $\mathcal{C}_i|\mathcal{H}^{enl}_{phys}\rangle_i = 0, \quad \mathcal{C}_i|\mathcal{H}^{enl}_{unphys}\rangle_i = 2$. Because of this, the local MF constraint $< \mathcal{C}_i >= 0$ still singles out the physical subspace. In contrast, the operators $n_i \vec{J}_i$ mix up the states in $\mathcal{H}^{enl}_{unphys}$ so that $< n_i \vec{J}_i >=< \vec{J}_i >= 0$ for the *unphysical* states $|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle_i + |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle_i$ and $|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle_i + e^{i\theta_i}|\downarrow\downarrow\rangle_i$. Moreover, since $< \vec{J}_i >\neq 0$ in the ferromagnetic ground state of the $U = \infty$ Hubbard model (where the doubly occupied states are strictly prohibited), the vanishing of the average magnitization claimed in [3] is a condition neither sufficient nor necessary for the NDO constraint to hold (as opposed to the requirement $< \mathcal{C}_i >= 0$).